

REMARKS

1. Summary of the Office Action

In the final Office Action mailed on July 3, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7-10, 12-21, and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,944,859 (Bunger). The Examiner rejected claims 6, 11, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bunger in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0015961 (Chefalas). The Examiner rejected claims 1, 9, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bunger in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,080,132 (Cheshire).

In the Advisory Action mailed on December 8, 2008, the Examiner maintained these rejections. The Examiner also indicated that “the new claims 25-32 which is system claims, and are rejected for the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claims 1-8.” Advisory Action, p. 2.

2. Summary of the Claims

Claims 1-32 are currently pending, of which claims 1, 9, 17, and 25 are independent and the remainder are dependent. In this response, Applicant has amended claims 1-32. These amendments are generally supported by the specification and specifically at least as indicated below.

3. Response to Claim Rejections

a. Claims 1, 9, 17, and 25 are not anticipated by Bunger, as Bunger does not disclose a station that controls access to a network by a host computer using network-specific data that is not accessible by a host computer.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7-10, 12-21, and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bunger. Of these claims, claims 1, 9, and 17 are independent. Further, based on the portion of the Advisory Action cited above, Applicant assumes indicated claim 25 is rejected as being anticipated by Bunger. *See* Advisory Action, p. 2.

In this response, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite, *inter alia*, “receiving a data block from the host computing device, wherein the host computing device uses the device driver to transfer the data block to the station, wherein the first portion of network-specific data enables the host computer to access the network, and wherein the station controls access to the network

by the host computer using the second portion of network-specific data that is not accessible by the host computing device.” Support for these amendments may be found generally throughout the specification and specifically in at least ¶¶ 0008 and 0034 of the specification.

Bunger describes downloading and installing files from an installation server onto a handheld computer. *See* Bunger, col. 4, lines 37-39. The handheld computer is linked to a client computer, which is in turn connected to the installation server via a network. Bunger, col. 4, lines 43-62. Bunger discloses use of a client-handheld conduit file “used to setup a direct communication link between the installation server and the handheld computer”. Bunger, col. 5, lines 55-57. A user may be authenticated by the installation server by use of username and password. Bunger, col. 8, lines 42-61. Once the user is authenticated, the client computer may request the client-handheld conduit file from the installation server. Bunger, col. 9, lines 6-15. The client computer synchronizes with the handheld computer and then installs the client-handheld conduit file on the handheld computer. Bunger, col. 9, lines 28-34. The client computer can save environment information sent from the handheld computer. Bunger, col. 10, lines 12-18.

However, Bunger does not disclose the use of data that is not accessible by the handheld computer, much less “access to the network by the host computer using a second portion of network-specific data that is not accessible by the host computing device” as recited in claim 1. Applicant therefore submits that Bunger does not disclose all of the subject matter recited in amended claim 1. As claims 9, 17, and 25 have also been amended to recite the above-mentioned subject matter of claim 1 using similar language, Applicant submits that Bunger does not anticipate amended claims 9, 17, and 25 for at least the reasons presented above for claim 1. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 1, 9, 17, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

b. Claims 1, 9, 17, and 25 are allowable over the Bunger/Cheshire combination as Cheshire does not cure the deficiencies of Bunger discussed above.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 9, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bunger in view of Cheshire. Of these claims, claims 1, 9, and 17 are independent. Further, based on the portion of the Advisory Action cited above, Applicant assumes indicated claim 25 is rejected as being unpatentable over the Bunger/Cheshire combination as well. *See* Advisory Action, p. 2.

As indicated above, amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, ““receiving a data block from the host computing device, wherein the host computing device uses the device driver to transfer the data block to the station, wherein the first portion of network-specific data enables the host computer to access the network, and wherein the station controls access to the network by the host computer using the second portion of network-specific data that is not accessible by the host computing device.” Applicant submits that Cheshire does not cure the deficiencies of Bunger, and thus claim 1 is allowable over the Cheshire/Bunger combination.

Cheshire describes instructing a processing system to present network configuration information sent from a server processing system to a client processing system, based on a request from the client processing system received by the server processing system. Cheshire, col. 2, lines 28-33. Cheshire indicates it is possible that the network configuration information includes presentation information to be provided to a client accessing a network. Cheshire, col. 3, lines 2-5.

However, Cheshire does not disclose or suggest the use of data that is not accessible by the server processing system or the client processing system, much less “access to the network by the host computer using a second portion of network-specific data that is not accessible by the host computing device” as recited in claim 1. Applicant therefore submits that Cheshire does not cure the deficiencies of Bunger in failing to disclose all of the subject matter recited in amended claim 1. As claims 9, 17, and 25 have also been amended to recite the above-mentioned subject matter of claim 1 using similar language, Applicant submits that Bunger does not anticipate amended claims 9, 17, and 25 for at least the reasons presented above for claim 1. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 1, 9, 17, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Further, Applicant submits that each of the dependent claims is allowable, for at least the reason that each dependent claim ultimately depends from an allowable base claim — either claim 1, 9, 17, or 25 — as shown above.

4. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all pending claims are allowable, and thus Applicant respectfully requests allowance of these claims. Should the Examiner wish to discuss this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (312) 913-3338.

Respectfully submitted,

**McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP**

Dated: January 5, 2009

By: /Thomas J. Loos/
Thomas J. Loos
Reg. No. 60,161